



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/500,884 | 10/18/2004 | Richard W. Compans | EU 01083 | 8675 |
| <div>23579 7590 07/02/2007</div> <div>PATREA L. PABST PABST PATENT GROUP LLP 400 COLONY SQUARE, SUITE 1200 1201 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30361</div> | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| MCINTOSH III, TRAVISS C | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1623 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 07/02/2007 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/500,884

Applicant(s)

COMPANS ET AL.

Examiner

Traviss C. McIntosh

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/5/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: the inclusion of the word "of" in line 2 of the claim does not seem necessary. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a period at the end of the 3rd to last line of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 30, 35 and 36 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. It is noted that the intended use of the compositions is not seen to further limit the actual composition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods and compositions for treating viral infections, does not reasonably provide enablement for methods and compositions prevention of viral infections. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1623

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Undue experimentation is a conclusion reached by weighing the noted factual considerations set forth below as seen in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding a fair evaluation of an appropriate combination of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

These factors include:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
 - (B) The nature of the invention;
 - (C) The state of the prior art;
 - (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
 - (E) The level of predictability in the art;
 - (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
 - (G) The existence of working examples; and
 - (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention
- based on the content of the disclosure.

The breadth of the claims/Nature of the Invention:

The claims are drawn to compositions and methods of preventing all viral infections, including HIV, HBV, HCV, and HSV, using the claimed porphyrin compounds. In the absence of an explicit definition in Applicant's specification, "Prevention" as recited in the instant claims, is interpreted to mean the complete and total blocking of all symptoms of a disorder for an indefinite period of time. Any therapy which merely reduces the number or severity of symptoms, or which is effective for a

Art Unit: 1623

period shorter than the subject's remaining lifespan, is considered to be ineffective at preventing a disorder.

The state of the prior art:

Prevention of any viral infection is not a recognized clinical outcome in the art. For example, regarding HIV, US 2002/0091158 states that "Despite all of the available pharmaceuticals for the treatment of HIV, there is still no cure for the deadly disease. HIV viruses continue to mutate and become resistant to existing drugs such as the reverse transcriptase inhibitors and protease inhibitors. Recently, a therapy of using two (2) or three (3) anti-HIV drugs in combination has been found effective in significantly lowering the HIV loads in AIDS patients. The results have been promising, however the virus continues to develop resistance to the drugs and the long-term outcome (survival and cure rates) is still unknown. Thus, the medical communities throughout the world continue to search for drugs that can prevent HIV infections, treat HIV carriers to prevent them from progressing to full-blown deadly AIDS, and treat the AIDS patient.

The level of predictability in the art:

Viral diseases are complex and can develop many different types of viruses, leading to the accumulation or depletion of many different products and intermediates. In many cases, it is not known whether there exists a specific step that can be targeted to effectively prevent the disorder. The generic goal of, "a method of preventing viral disorders" would be highly complex as one particular method, comprising administering one particular compound, would have to protect any possible cell from all viral infections in the subject's body. Moreover, prevention of a disease is not the same as treatment of said disease. In order to prevent a disease, as opposed to merely delaying or reducing its

Art Unit: 1623

symptoms, a dosing must either render the subject completely resistant to said disease after a single treatment or a limited number of treatments, or else, when continued indefinitely, continue to completely suppress the occurrence of said disease. In order to practice a preventative method, one of skill in the art must know the answer to several questions in addition to the effectiveness of the therapy in short-term relief of symptoms, including: 1) What is the duration of a single course of therapy? How often must the therapy be administered to completely suppress the disease? 2) Does the subject develop tolerance to the therapy over time? Does the disease eventually progress to a point where the therapy is unable to completely suppress all symptoms? For example, will the HIV virus eventually mutate to be unaffected by the therapy? Or will HIV ultimately progress to a point where symptoms develop regardless of which therapy is administered. 3) What are the long-term effects of the therapy? Does it cause progressive damage to the kidneys, liver, or other organs? Does the active agent accumulate in the subject's tissues? Is the minimum dose necessary to completely prevent the disease safe for long-term administration? Are there any steps that can be taken to reduce side effects? Additionally, because various physiological systems are interdependent and affect one another, any hypothetical preventative treatment would have to be broad-based and treat all of the various viruses. For this reason, many therapies which are suitable for short-term relief of symptoms are not suitable for lifelong prevention of disease. For example, antibiotics, chemotherapeutics, and antiviral drugs are not normally administered to healthy subjects in order to prevent the development of infection or cancer.

The amount of direction provided by the inventor:

Art Unit: 1623

The instant specification is not seen to provide adequate guidance which would allow the skilled artisan to extrapolate from the disclosure and examples provided to use the claimed method commensurate in the scope with the instant claims. There is a lack of data and examples which adequately represent the scope of claim as written. The examiner notes, there has not been provided sufficient instruction or sufficient methodological procedures to support the alleged efficacy of prevention instantly asserted.

The existence of working examples:

No working examples are given for the long-term treatment of in vivo use to prevent viral conditions. Note that lack of working examples which are correlative in scope to that which is claimed is a critical factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art such as the prevention any viral infection with a single agent. See MPEP 2164.

The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure:

Practicing the full scope of the invention would present an undue burden of unpredictable experimentation to one skilled in the art. *Genentech*, 108 F.3d at 1366, states that, "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." And "patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable." Therefore, in view of the *Wands* factors, as discussed above, applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention for the prevention of viral infections with the claimed compounds.

Art Unit: 1623

As mentioned above, the short-term usefulness of a therapy for relief of symptoms is no guarantee of its long-term usefulness for prevention of disease. Because no guidance is given for the use of the claimed therapeutic method for the long-term prevention of disease, one skilled in the art wishing to practice the invention would be unable to do so without first gathering information as to the long-term effectiveness of the therapy. In particular, one skilled in the art, in order to practice the invention for prevention of disease, would need to know whether the preventative effect remains potent over the long term. In order to answer these questions in the absence of any existing data, one skilled in the art, in order to practice the invention, would undertake long-term animal tests, preferably over a period of years, preferably involving a relatively long-lived experimental animal such as dogs or monkeys, or a human clinical trial. Animal experiments include, along with induction of the disease state, administration of the potential pharmaceutical compound and collection and analysis of data, additional burdens associated with compliance with animal welfare regulations, care, feeding, and other maintenance of the animals, dissection of dead animals to collect data, and disposal of dead animals after the protocol is finished. Administering the claimed compounds for a period of years to a suitable subject population is an undue amount of experimentation needed in order to practice the full range of the claimed invention. As prevention in the full sense is an extremely high bar for any clinical outcome, there is no reason to believe that the therapy would be successful, and any actual success would be a surprising and unpredictable result.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1623

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 8, 23, and 39 include the limitation of the R-groups being various “**substituted**” groups. In the absence of the identity of moieties which are intended to be substituted, thus modifying an art recognized chemical core, described structurally or by chemical name, the identity of “substituted” would be difficult to ascertain. In the absence of said moieties, the claims containing the term “substituted” are not described sufficiently to distinctly point out that which applicant intends as the invention.

Claims 6 and 37 are drawn to various “derivatized sulfonic acid groups”. In the absence of the identity of moieties intended to modify an art recognized chemical core, described structurally or by chemical name, the identity of a derivative would be difficult to ascertain. In the absence of said moieties, the claims containing the term “derivative” are not described particularly sufficiently to distinctly point out that which applicant intends as the invention.

The term “rapid” in claim 12 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term “rapid” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear what is encompassed by “rapid elimination from the body”.

Art Unit: 1623

Claims 10-11, 34, and 41-42 are indefinite as the Markush groups of proposed agents is confusing. Some of the acronyms are separated by commas, some by semicolons, etc. It is unclear what the actual compounds are that applicants are intended these claims to limit the compositions/methods to comprise.

Claims 39 and 41 are indefinite wherein the claims provide the composition is effective to inhibit replication of a HIV virus, but how could they replicate if applicants have effectively prevented the condition as there would not be a virus to inhibit replicating?

All claims which depend from an indefinite claim are also indefinite. *Ex parte Cordova, 10 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1949, 1952 (P.T.O. Bd. App. 1989).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 23-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dixon et al. (US 5,281,616).

Dixon discloses compositions comprising porphyrins claimed in the instant application (see claim 1 and 3, and the figures for example) and additional antiviral agents (see claims 7-8). Dixon teaches their composition should include various carriers as well as be administered via various routes (column 11, lines 1-53). Dixon teaches their

Art Unit: 1623

compositions should contain an "HIV inhibitory effect" (column 10, lines 60-70). It is noted that the compositions of the prior art are seen to anticipate the compositions claimed herein, as they comprise the same active agent in the same amounts, as such, are seen to be the same.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Traviss C. McIntosh whose telephone number is 571-272-0657. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Traviss McIntosh
June 24, 2007
Art Unit 1623

